

## **IN THE DRAWINGS**

Figs. 2 and 6 had been placed in the same paper sheet, and have been separated into two separated sheets.

One copy of the amended formal drawings, including the amended and separated Figs. 2 and 6 is enclosed herewith, as replacement sheets.

## **REMARKS**

The Final Official Action dated 06 January 2006 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(u)(1) because the views are improperly grouped. Fig. 6 appears on the second sheet, but Fig. 5 does not appear until the fourth sheet.

In response, the drawing Figures. 2 and 6 have been separated into two separated paper sheets. The replacement sheets of the drawing Figures. 2 and 6 are enclosed herewith.

The title has further been amended to correctly read --  
**CONNECTING SHAFT DEVICE--.**

The disclosure is objected to because of several informalities.

In response, the disclosure has been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 8 and 12, lines last recite the limitation. "[said positioning balls] allow the socket to be rotated relative to said connecting shaft.". However, there is no structure which would allow the socket and shaft to rotate relative to each other yet still remain connected to each other. The positioning balls 32 & 33 instead allow the socket 31 to be pivoted relative to the connecting shaft 10/30 (see Fig. 9) while the shaft and socket are connected together.

In response, claims 8 and 12 have been amended accordingly.

Claims 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as been unpatentable over Haxebrook et al, US 4,941,862 (Haxebrook).

However, the claimed subject matters in claims 9 and 12-14 have not been rejected by the cited arts.

In response, claims 8 and 12 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as set forth in this Office Action.

Claim 9 which has not been rejected by the cited arts has been deleted and has been included into claim 8.

Accordingly, claims 8 and 10-14 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner BINDA are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.